

## R E M A R K S

In the Office Action dated April 1, 2005, claims 1 through 11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph as failing to comply with the written description requirement, because the Examiner stated the limitation that was added in claim 1 "said guide rail being adapted to receive said patient bed thereon" differs from the language in the specification at page 5, lines 11-12 wherein it is stated that the rail system is placed on the patient bed.

In response, independent claim 1 has been amended to employ language consistent with the language in the specification.

Since no prior art was applied against claims 1 through 11, and since claims 12 and 13 were allowed, Applicants submit this change in claim 1, to employ language consistent with the present specification, does not raise a new issue requiring further searching or consideration. Claim 1 and the claims depending therefrom are submitted to be allowable over the art of record for the same reasons that claims 12 and 13 were allowed, and no additional searching or consideration is necessary on that point.

Since the present Amendment places all claims of the application in condition for allowance and does not raise any new issues requiring further searching or consideration, entry thereof after the final rejection is proper, and the same is respectively requested.

Submitted by,

*Steven H. Noll* (Reg. 28,982)

Schiff, Hardin LLP  
**CUSTOMER NO. 26574**  
Patent Department  
6600 Sears Tower  
233 South Wacker Drive  
Chicago, Illinois 60606  
Telephone: 312/258-5790  
Attorneys for Applicant.

CH1\ 4264767.1